UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

KEMOKALAM NJEMANZE,

Movant,

-v.-

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent

20 Civ. 5359 (KPF) 18 Cr. 117-7 (KPF)

ORDER

KATHERINE POLK FAILLA, District Judge:

The Court is in receipt of Movant's motion to vacate, set aside, or correct his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. In reviewing the motion papers, the Court is concerned that Movant, while researching and drafting his motion, inadvertently relied on sources that may not apply to his case. In order to advance his best arguments, Movant is invited to file an amended motion.

Movant is encouraged to review the transcripts from his sentencing and plea (attached here), as well as to cite Second Circuit precedent (which is binding on this Court), instead of Fifth Circuit precedent (which is not binding).

Movant is invited to file an amended motion on or before August 31, 2020. Should he decline to file an amended motion and choose to proceed with his current motion, the Court requests that Movant notify the Court as soon as possible so that the Court may set a briefing schedule.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 16, 2020

New York, New York

A copy of this Order was mailed by Chambers to:

Kemokalam Njemanze Reg. No. 86803-054 Federal Correctional Institution P.O Box 3850 Adelanto, CA 92301 KATHERINE POLK FAILLA United States District Judge

Katherin Palle Fails

```
J4BKNJEP
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                              18 CR 117 (KPF)
                 V.
5
     KEMOKALAM NJEMANZE,
6
                     Defendant.
           -----x
 7
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
                                              April 11, 2019
9
                                               4:10 p.m.
10
     Before:
11
                        HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA,
12
                                               District Judge
13
                                APPEARANCES
14
15
     GEOFFREY S. BERMAN,
          United States Attorney for the
16
           Southern District of New York
     ROBERT B. SOBELMAN
17
          Assistant United States Attorney
18
     TODD A. SPODEK
           Attorney for Defendant
19
20
     ALSO PRESENT:
21
     GREGORY HOLM, Secret Service
     LISA CHAN, Pretrial Services
22
23
24
25
```

25

1 (Case called) MR. SOBELMAN: Robert Sobelman, for the United States. 2 3 I'm joined at counsel table by Special Agent Gregory Holm, of the United States Secret Service. Good afternoon, your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 6 MR. CHAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Lisa Chan, for 7 pretrial. 8 THE COURT: Thank you very much. I have your report, 9 sir. 10 MR. SPODEK: Good afternoon, your Honor. Todd Spodek, 11 for Mr. Njemanze. 12 THE COURT: Okay. And may I address your client 13 directly? 14 MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. Of course. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. Sir, good afternoon. Tell me, first, how do you 16 17 pronounce your last name? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Njemanze. 19 THE COURT: Njemanze, am I saying it correctly? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, it is my understanding, sir, 22 that this is your first appearance in federal court. Is that 23 correct? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: I understand.

24

25

much.

1 So there are several things we are going to do today, and if at any time what I am saying to you doesn't make sense, 2 3 just let me know, and I will clarify things for you. 4 As you may have figured out, I'm Katherine Failla, I'm a United States district judge, and it is my understanding that 5 you have agreed, or consented, to the waiver of indictment and 6 7 the allowing of a filing of an information. Is that correct, sir? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 10 THE COURT: And so I'll talk to you about that a 11 little bit in a moment, but because of that, I want to talk to 12 you about what happened now that your case has been assigned to 13 me. 14 Let me begin by asking some very preliminary 15 questions. 16 So far, sir, do you understand everything that I have 17 said? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, ma'am. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 Could I understand from the government, please, the 21 date and the time of the arrest? 22 MR. SOBELMAN: Mr. Njemanze was arrested --23 self-surrendered today at 10:00 a.m.

THE COURT: Surrendered at 10:00 a.m. Thank you very

Mr. Njemanze, the purpose of this proceeding is to 1 advise you of your rights, to talk to you about your right to 2 3 counsel, to determine whether there are circumstances that 4 would allow you to be released on bail, and then what's a 5 little bit different about this case is, based on the 6 conversations your attorney has had with the government, it is 7 my understanding that you wish to have the filing of the 8 information, and you wish to enter a guilty plea to that 9 information. 10 So that's a lot of things happening this afternoon, 11 but are you aware of -- and is that what you wish to happen? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 13 THE COURT: It is my understanding -- Mr. Spodek is retained by you, sir, as counsel? 14 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. THE COURT: Mr. Spodek, let us talk. 16 17 MR. SPODEK: Sure. 18 THE COURT: Because I believe you've appeared in an 19 earlier case --20 MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: -- that's somehow related to this matter. 22 So let me understand your view, sir, and then the 23 government's views about the inquiry that I should undertake of 24 Mr. Njemanze to make sure he's aware of any potential

25

conflicts.

MR. SPODEK: Sure.

Earlier on in a case, the case with the same individuals involved, I did represent a defendant in that matter for plea purposes. I'm no longer representing him. My investigation with my prior client, there was no overlap between these two individuals, they never spoke, they don't know of each other, there's no information that either of them have as to the other and/or their role, or capacity, or anything.

I also spoke with Mr. Njemanze about the same situation, and he assured me that he didn't know my other client and didn't have any other information about him and/or his involvement in this or knew anything about him. So I explained to him that there potentially could be a conflict and made sure that he understood that, and he said he had no issue whatsoever. We talked about this previously with the government, and I understand, just for precaution purposes, your Honor, to let your Honor know about it, and you can inquire certainly of my client.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Sobelman, do you have the same perspective, sir?

MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor. The government's not aware of, aside from their involvement in an overall scheme,

any personal interaction or knowledge of Mr. Spodek's prior

client and Mr. Spodek's current client of each other, and, in

our view, there is, I guess, a theoretical potential conflict that we wanted to make sure the defendant and the Court is aware of, but we don't believe there's any actual conflict at all.

THE COURT: So you're not asking me, neither side is asking me, for a full robust Curcio proceeding, more of a more preliminary inquiry; is that correct?

MR. SOBELMAN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Again, Mr. Spodek, may I address your client directly?

MR. SPODEK: Yes, of course, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Njemanze, I want to make sure you understand the conversations that I was just having with your attorney and with the attorney for the government. Because Mr. Spodek represented another individual involved in this matter at an earlier proceeding, the concern that one might have is that you might not have his undivided attention or his undivided representation. What I understand from the representations that have been made to me, by him and by the government, is that this is one of those circumstances in which you and the other individual may have been involved in this matter, but didn't know each other, had no overlap of actions, and, therefore, information that Mr. Spodek might have that is specific to that prior representation would not be shared with

you, would not aid you, would not harm you, would not do anything. And so I will ask you, sir: Have you spoken with Mr. Spodek about his prior representation?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I have.

THE COURT: Were you listening today when he and the prosecutor discussed their understanding of the knowledge that he would have from that prior representation?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Is that your understanding as well, that he knows something about representing this other person, and knows something from representing you, and doesn't have any overlap between the two?

Is that your understanding, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: So with that in mind, do you waive any conflicts that might otherwise adhere anything that would result from his prior representation?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: I understand that. I don't believe there is a conflict, but I do think you and I both have the same base of knowledge about it. You have the right, of course, sir, to waive it, and I understand that you're so doing.

Again, because I believe in making sure everything is out there, the concern that would be had is that there might be information that he has about you or information that he might

have about that other client that might impact his 1 2 representation of the other of you. 3 Do you have that understanding, sir? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do. 5 THE COURT: And I'm now understanding that he no longer represents this other individual, so information from 6 7 you won't be used in any respect, and the information that he has from that prior representation has no bearing on your case. 8 9 Do you understand that, sir? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. 12 understand that. 13 So, Mr. Spodek, you will remain his retained counsel 14 in this case. 15 Mr. Sobelman? 16 MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor, just for clarity of 17 the record, I don't think any of us actually said the name of the other client. 18 19 THE COURT: No. Do you wish me to? 20 MR. SOBELMAN: I actually do, just to make sure we're 21 all talking about the same person.

THE COURT: Of course.

22

23

24

25

MR. SOBELMAN: The individual is Okechukwu Peter Ezika, just for the record, so that when we all refer to the prior person, the prior client, we can make sure we're talking

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about the same person.

THE COURT: It is very wise that you are doing that.

May I ask you, please, for the benefit of the reporter and the judge, to spell the first name of that individual.

MR. SOBELMAN: I believe it's O-k-e-c-h-u-w-k-u, but his name is also reflected on the docket in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

You understood, sir -- and let me ask, please:
Mr. Njemanze, you had the ability to speak with Mr. Spodek
about the name of this individual?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: And when you heard the name, it wasn't somebody you knew?

THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. Thank you.

And, Mr. Sobelman, do you believe that's enough inquiry in that matter?

MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Now, Mr. Njemanze, you have the right to remain silent. What I mean by that is, you're not required to make any statements here, any statements to law enforcement authorities, and if you've started to make a statement, you can stop making the statement. If you've already made the statements, you don't have to say any more, but if you do make

a statement, that statement might be used against you at trial or at another proceeding.

Are you aware of that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: It is your intention today, however, as I understand it, to waive indictment and to enter a plea of guilty to the information, the superseding information; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Let me talk to you about that, please, sir.

I have a number of questions to ask you, and let me explain the purposes that these questions serve.

The first thing that I want to do -- and I believe I understand this already from having had five minutes of discussions with you -- but I want to make sure that you are competent to do each of these things that you wish to do today, so I will ask you questions in that regard. And if, in fact, you are competent, then I'll ask you some questions about your rights to waive indictment and, separately, about the rights that you have with respect to pleading guilty.

Just as I said at the beginning of this, sir, the most important thing is that you understand what's going on. If anything is unclear to you, please let me know. All right, sir?

```
1
               THE DEFENDANT: Okay, ma'am.
 2
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 3
               Ms. Noriega, can you, please, swear in Mr. Njemanze.
 4
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, your Honor.
 5
               (Defendant sworn)
 6
               THE DEPUTY CLERK:
                                 Thank you.
 7
               Please state your name for the record.
 8
               THE DEFENDANT: Njemanze, Kemakolam.
9
               THE COURT: May I ask you, please, sir, to spell your
10
      name?
11
               THE DEFENDANT: Last name N-j-e-m-a-n-z-e, first name
12
      Kemakolam, K-e-m-a-k-o-l-a-m, middle name Gozie, G-o-z-i-e.
13
               THE COURT: Thank you very much. And you are welcome
14
     to be seated.
15
               Let me just pause for a moment. Let me ask the
      pretrial services officer: It would be my preference to go
16
17
      through the plea proceeding before addressing the issue of bail
      because I think it would impact it, but I don't want to
18
19
      complicate your entire afternoon. If the parties agree to take
20
      it out of order, I can do the bail proceedings at this time.
21
               MR. CHAN: Whatever is your wish, your Honor.
22
      fine to stay.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. Then I thank you very much for
24
     doing that. Thank you.
25
               Mr. Njemanze, how old are you, sir?
```

```
1
               THE DEFENDANT: Thirty-five, ma'am.
               THE COURT: Thirty-five. Thank you.
 2
 3
               I should let you know the significance of my having my
 4
      deputy place you under oath is that if you answer any of the
 5
      questions that I'm about to ask you falsely, you could be
6
      prosecuted for a separate offense. That offense is known as
 7
      perjury.
8
               Do you understand that, sir?
9
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
10
               THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, how far did you go in
      school?
11
12
               THE DEFENDANT: Bachelor's in engineering.
13
               THE COURT: Was that here in the U.S. or in Nigeria?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Back in Nigeria.
15
               THE COURT: Sir, have you ever been treated or
      hospitalized for any form of mental illness?
16
17
               THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
18
               THE COURT: Were you now, or have you recently been,
19
      under the care of a doctor or a psychiatrist?
20
               THE DEFENDANT: Psychiatrist? No, ma'am.
21
               THE COURT: Let me ask the other question. It's my
22
      fault for combining them.
23
               Have you recently been under the care of a doctor,
24
      sir?
25
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Are you comfortable discussing the medical
      condition on the record?
 2
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 4
               THE COURT: Could you tell me, please, the reasons --
5
      were you seeing a doctor for a regular checkup or for something
6
     more specific?
 7
               THE DEFENDANT: I had heart problems a couple of
     months back, so I went -- I had this chest pain, I went to the
8
9
      hospital, and they had to -- they checked my troponin, they
10
      said it was high, my blood pressure was high, so they admitted
11
     me in the hospital. I was there about six days or thereabout.
12
      Then, two days after I was admitted, they had to rush me -- I
13
      underwent a heart procedure.
14
               THE COURT: You were having a heart attack, sir, or a
      heart condition?
15
               THE DEFENDANT: I almost had a heart attack.
16
17
               THE COURT: I see.
18
               THE DEFENDANT: That's what the doctor said.
                                                              So,
19
      afterwards, he placed me on heart attack prevention
20
     medications.
21
               THE COURT: Blood thinners or something of that type,
22
      sir?
23
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, blood thinners as well, yes,
24
     ma'am.
25
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
```

```
1
               When was the last time you were hospitalized for your
      heart conditions?
 2
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: April 2018.
               THE COURT: About a year ago?
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 5
 6
               THE COURT: Are you continuing to take medication --
 7
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 8
               THE COURT: -- for your heart conditions?
9
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
10
               THE COURT: About how many medications are you taking,
11
      sir?
               THE DEFENDANT: About five.
12
13
               THE COURT: And do you know what they are? And it's
      fine if you don't. You can --
14
15
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
16
               THE COURT: Tell me, please, what they are and speak
17
      slowly, because I want to make sure I understand them.
18
               THE DEFENDANT: Hydrochlorothiazide, Coreg,
19
      amlodipine, atorvastatin, and aspirin.
20
               THE COURT: Each of those is designed to aid your
21
      heart's -- the issues that your heart was having?
22
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
23
               THE COURT: Do these medications, alone or in
24
      combination, impact your ability to see, hear, or understand
      what's going on in the courtroom this afternoon?
25
```

1	THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
2	THE COURT: Other than the medical attention you
3	received for your heart, have you recently been under the care
4	of a doctor for any other reason?
5	THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
6	THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized
7	for any form of addiction, including drug or alcohol addiction?
8	THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
9	THE COURT: In the last two days, other than the
10	medications we've just talked about for your heart, have you
11	taken any drugs, medicine, or pills of any type?
12	THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
13	THE COURT: In the last two days, have you consumed
14	any alcoholic beverages?
15	THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
16	THE COURT: Is your mind clear today, sir?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Sorry?
18	THE COURT: Yes. Is your mind clear today?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. Yes.
20	THE COURT: Do you understand what's happening in this
21	courtroom this afternoon?
22	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
23	THE COURT: And let me, please, speak with your
24	attorney.
25	Mr. Spodek, have you had enough of an opportunity to

25

discuss this matter with your client? 1 MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. 2 3 THE COURT: Do you believe he understands the rights 4 that he has, and that he would be waiving, if he decided to 5 proceed by way of information and if he decided to plead quilty 6 to that information? 7 MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Do you believe he understands these 9 proceedings this afternoon? 10 MR. SPODEK: Absolutely. 11 THE COURT: Do you have any doubt as to his 12 competence? 13 MR. SPODEK: No doubts, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 Mr. Sobelman, the same question: Do you have any doubt as to Mr. Njemanze's competence to waive indictment, if 16 he wishes to do so, or to plead guilty, if he wishes to do so? 17 18 MR. SOBELMAN: No, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Thank you for letting me know. 20 Mr. Njemanze, based on your representations and your 21 discussions with me this afternoon, based as well on my 22 observations of your demeanor here in court, based on the 23 conversations that I've just had with your attorney and with 24 the attorney for the government, I find that you are fully

competent to waive indictment, if you wish to do so, and to

```
enter a plea of guilty, if you wish to do so.
1
 2
               I'm going to ask you, sir: Do you have a copy of a
 3
      document in front of you?
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: I just want you to let me finish my
      question. And I understand you're trying to be very helpful,
6
 7
     but I want the record to be clear.
8
               I have a document that, in the upper right-hand
9
      corner, says "Waiver of Indictment." Do you have a similar
10
     document, sir?
11
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
12
               THE COURT: The copy that I have has three signatures
13
      on it.
14
               Does yours, as well, have three signatures?
15
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, it does.
16
               THE COURT: Is one of those signatures yours?
17
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
18
               THE COURT: I'm going to mark my copy as Court Exhibit
19
      1, just so that we know the document we're speaking of, and you
20
      will see I've written it in the upper right-hand corner. Do
21
      you see that, sir?
22
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
23
               THE COURT: Before you signed this document, did you
24
     read it?
25
```

1 THE COURT: Before you signed this document, did you discuss it with your attorney? 2 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 4 THE COURT: Do you understand, sir, that you are under 5 no obligation to waive indictment in this case? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 7 THE COURT: Do you also understand that if you did not waive indictment, and the government wanted to bring charges 8 9 against you, they would have to present those charges to a 10 grand jury, and that grand jury might decide to indict you on 11 those charges and it might decide not to indict you on those 12 charges? 13 Are you aware of that, sir? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I am. 15 THE COURT: Do you understand that by waiving indictment, what you're doing is giving up your right to have 16 17 this case presented to the grand jury? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 19 THE COURT: I've used the term "grand jury." 20 know what I'm speaking of when I use that term, sir? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do. 22 THE COURT: I don't want to know the specifics of your 23 communications, but have you discussed with your attorney what 24 the grand jury is and what purposes it serves? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Do you need any information, additional information, from me about the grand jury or your right to proceed by way of indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am. That's fine.

THE COURT: And is it your wish, sir, to proceed by way of information, to waive your right to proceed by indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Mr. Spodek, do you know of any reason why
I should not find that your client has knowingly and
voluntarily waived his right to be indicted?

MR. SPODEK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Sobelman, the same question: Do you know of any reason why I should not find that Mr. Njemanze has knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to be indicted by a grand jury?

MR. SOBELMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Njemanze, again, based on our conversations, I find that you are knowingly and voluntarily waiving your right to proceed by way of indictment, and I am going to authorize the filing of the information in this case, and it's been marked "Superseding Information," it says in the upper right-hand corner S6:18 CR 117.

Do you see that, sir?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
2	THE COURT: You have a copy of this information, as do
3	I.
4	Have you read this document, sir?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I have.
6	THE COURT: Have you had whatever time you needed to
7	discuss this document with your attorney?
8	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, would you like me to read
10	this document in open court?
11	THE DEFENDANT: No.
12	THE COURT: You will waive its public reading, sir?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	More specifically, sir, have you had enough of an
16	opportunity to speak with your attorney about the charge to
17	which you intend to plead guilty and any possible defenses that
18	you might have to that charge?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
20	THE COURT: Without giving me the specifics of your
21	communications, has your attorney explained to you the
22	consequences of entering a plea of guilty?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, he has.
24	THE COURT: Are you satisfied with his representation
25	of you in this matter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, what I'm going to do is change topics right now. I'm going to talk to you about rights that you have under the Constitution and laws of the United States. These are rights that you would be waiving were you to enter a plea of guilty in this case. You have been paying very careful attention to everything that I've said. I'm going to ask you to continue to do that. And if anything is confusing to you, sir, please let me know.

Will you do that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I will.

THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you have the right to enter a plea of not guilty to the charge contained in this information. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: If you decided to plead not guilty, you would be entitled to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charge contained in the information. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: And I'm using the term "information." I know the document says "Superseding Information." But do you understand that's what I'm speaking of?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: I appreciate it. I thought you did.

If there were a trial, sir, you would be presumed to be innocent, and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt before you could be found guilty.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: A jury of 12 people would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty of this offense. You would not have to prove that you were innocent of the offense if you went to trial.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: At a trial, and at every stage of your case, you are — of your prosecution, you are entitled to the assistance of an attorney. If, and to the extent that you could not afford an attorney, one is appointed for you at public expensive, free of cost to you, in order to represent you.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: If there were a trial in this case, the government's witnesses would have to come into court and testify in your presence, your attorney could cross-examine the government's witnesses, he could object to the government's

evidence, and he could offer evidence on your behalf if you wanted him to do so. You would also have the right to have subpoenas, or other documents, or process used in order to compel witnesses to testify in your defense.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: If there were a trial in this case, sir, you would have the right to testify, if you wanted to do so, and you would have the right not to testify, if you wanted not to do so. If you decided not to testify, no one, including the jury, could draw any inference or suggestion of guilt from your decision not to testify.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: Another consequence of entering a guilty plea in this manner is that you are giving up, or waiving, your right to seek suppression, or exclusions, of the government's evidence against you.

Are you aware of that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I am.

THE COURT: So have you had enough of an opportunity to speak with your attorney about whether there is any basis to seek suppression or exclusion of part or all of the government's evidence against you?

THE COURT: Do you understand, sir, that if you were convicted after a trial, you would have the right to appeal from the jury's verdict?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that even now, as you're entering this guilty plea, you have the right to change your mind and to enter a plea of not guilty to the charge contained in the information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, if you plead guilty, and if I accept your guilty plea, you will give up your right to trial and the other rights that I've been discussing with you, other than your right to an attorney. You have the right to an attorney whether you plead guilty or go to trial. But if you plead guilty, and if I accept your guilty plea, there will be no trial, I will enter a judgment of guilty on Count One of this information, I will sentence you at a later date based on information that I receive from you here today, information that I receive from the United States Probation Office in a document known as a presentence investigation report, and information that I receive from you and your attorney and from the attorney for the government at the time of sentencing.

If you plead guilty, and if I accept your guilty plea, there would be no appeal on the issue of whether the government could use the evidence that it has against you. There would

also be no appeal on the issue of whether you committed the offense to which you plead guilty. I appreciate that I've said a lot there, sir, but I've watched you follow along.

Do you understand each of the things I've said?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: I also want to make sure you understand that by pleading guilty, you will have to give up, at least in part, your right not to incriminate yourself. What I mean by that is: I will ask you questions later in this proceeding to confirm that you are pleading guilty because you are, in fact, guilty and not for some other reason. You will have to admit and acknowledge your guilt of the offense charged in Count One.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, do you understand each of the rights that I've been discussing with you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: Would you like me to provide any additional or clarifying information about any of those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: No, that's fine. Thank you.

THE COURT: Sir, are you willing to give up your right to trial and these other rights that I've mentioned to you and enter a plea of guilty to Count One of this information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: Let us, then, talk about that charge.

You are charged with participating in a conspiracy to commit money laundering. That's in violation of Section 1956(h) of Title 18 of the United States Code. Are you aware of that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I am.

THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, I'm going to ask for your attention, and I will be paying attention as well. I'm going to ask the prosecutor to outline for both of us the elements of this offense.

Thank you, Mr. Sobelman.

MR. SOBELMAN: Count One of the superseding information charges the defendant with conspiring to commit money laundering. Specifically, the elements are that: Two or more people agreed to violate the money laundering laws of the United States, and that the defendant was part of that agreement.

The particular object of Count One has five elements, as charged in the indictment:

First, that one conducted or attempted to conduct;

Two, a financial transaction;

Three, knowing that the property involved in such a financial transaction represented the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity;

Four, which, in fact, involved the proceeds of specified unlawful activity, here, wire fraud;

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, five, that the defendant acted with the knowledge that the transaction was designed, in whole or in part, to disquise the nature, location, source, ownership, or control of the proceeds of the specified unlawful activity. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Njemanze, were you able to hear the prosecutor just now? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. THE COURT: Do you understand, sir, that if you were to proceed to trial, that is what the government would have to prove at a trial? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I understand. THE COURT: Mr. Sobelman, you'll please excuse me if I overlooked this. Did you discuss venue at all? MR. SOBELMAN: I didn't, your Honor. THE COURT: Is this a case in which venue is waived? MR. SOBELMAN: I believe it is, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Spodek, do you agree, sir? MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. Just so that Mr. Njemanze is clear, sir, when I speak

about venue, what I mean is that some piece of the offense took

place in this district. Do you understand that, sir?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: That is something that can be waived.
                                                            Ι
understand from your counsel that venue in the Southern
District of New York is being waived. Is that your
understanding as well?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: All right.
         Sir, what I'm going to do now is to talk to you about
the maximum possible penalties that are associated with this
offense. Maximum means most, and it's the most that is
permitted by statute. And I'm doing that, sir, because I want
to make sure you understand that by entering a plea of guilty,
you're exposing yourself to the possibility of receiving any
combination of punishments up to the statutory maximum terms
that I'm about to describe for you.
        Do you understand that, sir?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
         THE COURT: I'm going to begin with restrictions on
your liberty.
         The maximum term of imprisonment for this offense is
20 years' imprisonment. Do you understand that, sir?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
         THE COURT: Do you understand that any term of
imprisonment that I impose could be followed by a term of up to
three years of supervised release?
```

THE COURT: Let me talk to you for a moment, please, about supervised release.

When I use that term, what I mean is a period of time where you are subject to supervision by the United States

Probation Office. There are terms and conditions of supervised release that you would have to follow, and if you were unable or unwilling to follow those terms and conditions of supervised release, the possibility exists that you could be sent to prison without a jury trial to serve term after a revocation of your supervised release. If that were the case, you could not get any credit for any time that you had spent serving a term of imprisonment. You would also not get any credit for any time that you had spent on supervised release in compliance with its terms.

Do you understand each of those things, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: I also want to make sure that you understand that there is no parole in the federal system. If you were sentenced to a term of imprisonment, you would not be released early on parole. There is the possibility that you could earn credit against your sentence for good behavior, but, generally speaking, you'd have to serve approximately 85 percent of any term of imprisonment imposed.

Do you understand that, sir?

24

25

1 THE COURT: There are also certain financial penalties that are associated, and these are in addition to any 2 3 restrictions on your liberty. 4 The maximum allowable fine here is the greatest of these three things: \$500,000, twice -- let me say this 5 6 correctly -- twice the value of the property involved. 7 Yes, those are the two things; am I correct, 8 Mr. Sobelman? 9 MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 11 So that would be the maximum allowable fine, the 12 greater of these two things. 13 I can order restitution to any person or entity 14 injured as a result of your conduct, which, here, may be 15 calculated at \$45,745.74. I can order you to forfeit any property derived from 16 17 the offense or used to facilitate the offense. 18 And I must order a mandatory special assessment of \$100 per count of conviction. 19 20 Do you understand each of those things, sir? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do. 22 THE COURT: And do you understand that those are the 23

maximum possible penalties that are associated with this offense?

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, I need to ask you a series 1 2 of questions. Not all of these questions may apply to you, but 3 I ask them in all cases. 4 Are you a United States citizen? 5 THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am. 6 THE COURT: Do you understand, sir, that a guilty plea 7 could have adverse effects on your immigration status, and that could include further detention following completion of any 8 9 term of imprisonment and/or the possibility of your removal or 10 deportation from the United States? 11 Are you aware of that, sir? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I am. 12 13 THE COURT: Without giving me the specifics, have you 14 discussed the possible immigration consequences of your plea 15 with your attorney? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Sobelman, given the last set of 18 answers, I'm not going to ask Mr. Njemanze about civil rights 19 he may lose. Do you agree, sir? 20 MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. 22

Mr. Njemanze, this is going to sound like an odd question. It is not meant to be. Are you serving any other sentence at this time, sir?

MR. SPODEK: Jail sentence.

24

25

1 THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am. 2 THE COURT: Are you being prosecuted in any other 3 jurisdiction other than this one? 4 THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am. 5 THE COURT: The reason I ask these questions is that 6 for some people, they have state criminal proceedings going on 7 at the same time as federal criminal proceedings, or sometimes there are folks who have parole board proceedings at the same 8 9 time they have these federal proceedings. What I wanted to make sure you understand is that resolving the case before me 10 11 doesn't necessarily resolve any other case that you might have. 12 If this is the one case of which you're aware, we'll just focus 13 on this one. 14 Without giving me the specifics, sir, have you and 15 your attorney discussed the process of sentencing? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, we have. 17 THE COURT: Do you understand that in connection with sentencing, there are a list of factors that I must consider? 18 19 They're contained in a statute that is 18, United States Code, 20 Section 3553(a). So they're sometimes called the 3553(a) 21 factors. 22 Are you aware that there are those factors that I must 23 consider at sentencing?

THE COURT: One of those factors, sir, is something

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I'm aware.

called the United States Sentencing Guidelines.

Is that a term with which you're familiar?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: If I use the term "guidelines" or "sentencing guidelines," that's what I'm referring to.

What I'd like to make sure you understand, sir, is that if anyone has attempted to predict for you what your ultimate sentence may be, their prediction could be incorrect. I will be the judge sentencing you. I need to hear from you today, I need to hear from the probation office in the future, and I need to hear from you, and your attorney, and the attorneys for the government at sentencing.

So, do you understand, sir, that today, no one can predict with any confidence what your ultimate sentence will be?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: And do you also understand, sir, that if your ultimate sentence is different from what your attorney or anyone else might have suggested that it might be, if it's different from what you expected or hoped for, and if it's different from any range contained in any agreement that you might have with the government, you would still be bound by your guilty plea? What I mean by that is you would not be able to withdraw your guilty plea based merely on dissatisfaction with your sentence.

1	Are you aware of that, sir?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I am.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, it is my understanding that
4	you are pleading today pursuant to a written plea agreement
5	with the government. Am I correct?
6	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, you are.
7	THE COURT: In connection with this proceeding, I have
8	been given a letter. The letter is dated February 8th of 2019,
9	and it is from the United States Attorney's Office for the
10	Southern District of New York, and it is sent to your attorney,
11	Mr. Spodek. It is a letter, and it includes, as well, certain
12	exhibits, including a consent preliminary order of forfeiture.
13	Have you seen this document, sir?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I have.
15	THE COURT: Do you have a copy in front of you, sir?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
17	THE COURT: Is this your written plea agreement with
18	the government?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, it is.
20	THE COURT: I am marking the copy that I've been given
21	as Court Exhibit 2, and at the end of this proceeding, I will
22	give my copy to the government to keep safe in connection with
23	sentencing.
24	I'm going to ask you, please, to turn to page 6 of
25	this letter. Are you there, sir?

```
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I'm there.
1
               THE COURT: On page 6, there are four signatures.
 2
                                                                  Are
 3
      there four signatures on your page 6, sir?
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, there are, ma'am.
 5
               THE COURT: Is one of them yours?
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Did you sign this document today, sir?
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.
 8
9
               THE COURT: Did you sign it in the presence of your
10
      attorney?
11
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I did.
12
               THE COURT: Before signing this document, did you read
13
      it?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.
15
               THE COURT: Did you discuss it for whatever length of
16
      time you needed to with your attorney?
17
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, we did discuss it.
18
               THE COURT: Did you understand this document at the
19
     time you signed it?
20
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
21
               THE COURT: I'm going to review certain portions of
22
      the document with you, sir, and I will not review every page of
23
      it. But I am going to ask you if you could turn to the first
24
     page -- actually, yes, let's go with the first page.
25
      there, sir?
```

25

particular way.

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I'm there. THE COURT: The last paragraph of the first page 2 3 indicates that you are admitting to the forfeiture allegation that is associated with Count One of this information. You're 4 5 agreeing to forfeit to the United States a sum of money equal 6 to \$103,359.24, representing the amount of property involved in 7 the offense. Is that your understanding, sir? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, it is. 10 THE COURT: Are you, in fact, admitting to the 11 forfeiture allegation that is contained in the indictment? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 13 THE COURT: I'm going to ask you, as well, please, 14 sir, to turn to page 2. Tell me when you're at page 2, please. 15 THE DEFENDANT: I'm there, ma'am. THE COURT: In the first full paragraph of page 2, 16 17 you're agreeing to make restitution in the amount of \$45,745.74 in accordance with certain statutes. The statutes listed there 18 19 are the federal restitution provisions. 20 Are you, in fact, agreeing to do that, sir? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I am. 22 THE COURT: For the remainder of this page, it is my 23 understanding that you and the government are agreeing, or 24 stipulating, that the quidelines apply to your case in a

```
1
               Is that your understanding, sir?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, it is.
 3
               THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, you do understand that I did
 4
      not sign this agreement. You did, your attorney did, the
 5
      government did. I'm not bound by it. I have an independent
6
      obligation to calculate the sentencing guidelines as they apply
 7
      to your case. I am not saying that I am coming up with a
      different number, but I am saying that I have an independent
8
9
      obligation to calculate them.
10
               Do you understand that, sir?
11
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
12
               THE COURT: Do you also understand that if I correctly
13
      calculate the quidelines and come up with a different range
14
      than you and the government have arrived at, that would not be
15
      a basis for you to withdraw from your guilty plea?
16
               Do you understand that, sir?
17
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
18
               THE COURT: I'm going to ask you, please, to turn to
19
     page 4 of the agreement, and let me know when you've gotten to
20
     page 4.
21
               THE DEFENDANT: I'm there, ma'am.
22
               THE COURT: I'm looking at the second full paragraph.
23
      It begins with the words, "It is agreed."
24
               Do you see that, sir?
25
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.
```

THE COURT: It is my understanding that this paragraph is a collection of waivers. You and the government are each waiving your right to appeal or otherwise challenge your sentence through a habeas petition, a motion to vacate the sentence, a motion to correct the sentence, a motion for a sentence reduction, or any other way, if certain things happen at sentencing.

Is that your understanding as well, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, it is.

THE COURT: I will talk to you about your waivers.

It is first my understanding that you are agreeing not to appeal or otherwise challenge any sentence of imprisonment within or below the stipulated guidelines range of 18 to 24 months' imprisonment. So if I impose a term of 24 months' imprisonment or something less than that, you are agreeing not to appeal or otherwise challenge that piece of your sentence.

Am I correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, you are.

THE COURT: I also understand that you're agreeing not to appeal any term of supervised release that is less than or equal to the statutory maximum of three years. So if I were to impose a term of three years of supervised release or something less than that, you are agreeing not to appeal that piece of your sentence.

Am I correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: I also understand that you are agreeing not to appeal any restitution figure that is less than or equal to \$45,745.74; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: And you are agreeing not to appeal any forfeiture amount that is less than or equal to \$103,359.24; am I also correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, you are.

THE COURT: If you look a little bit further down, at the last paragraph on that page -- and this carries over onto page 5 -- you're recognizing that this guilty plea and this conviction may make it very likely that you will be deported from the United States, or that it is presumptively mandatory, or, at the very least, that you are at risk of being deported, or suffering other adverse immigration consequences.

Have you read that paragraph, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I have.

THE COURT: And do you understand that there may be adverse immigration consequences that occur as a result of this guilty plea? Is that your understanding?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, does this agreement that you and I have been talking about this afternoon constitute your complete and total understanding of the agreement you have with

```
1
      the government?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 3
               THE COURT: Has anything been left out, sir?
 4
               THE DEFENDANT:
                              No, ma'am.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. I wanted to ask the question
6
      from both sides. So let me ask a different question:
 7
               Other than what is contained in this plea agreement,
8
      has anyone made you any promise or offered you any type of
9
      inducement in order to get you to sign this agreement or to
10
     plead quilty here this afternoon?
11
               THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
12
               THE COURT: Has anyone forced or threatened you to
13
      sign this agreement or to plead quilty here this afternoon?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
15
               THE COURT: Has anyone made you any promise as to what
16
      your ultimate sentence will be?
17
               THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
18
               THE COURT: Could you please tell me, in your own
19
      words, what it is you did that makes you believe that you are
20
      quilty of the offense charged in Count One of this information?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: Conspiracy to commit money laundering.
22
               THE COURT: All right. Let me, please, talk to you
23
      about that.
24
               Did this take place -- well, would you prefer that I
25
      ask you some questions, or is there more that you'd like to
```

```
1
      tell me, sir?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: No, that's fine.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay.
               Sir, I'm understanding that this conduct took place
 4
 5
      between 2016 and at least 2017; is that correct?
 6
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 7
               THE COURT: And so in conspiring, what you did, as I
      understand it, was you agreed with other people; is that
8
9
      correct?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
11
               THE COURT: And you agreed to commit a criminal act;
12
      is that also correct?
13
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
14
               THE COURT: When I say you agreed with other people,
15
      the people with whom you had this agreement, they were not law
16
      enforcement, were they, sir?
17
               THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
18
               THE COURT: Okay.
19
               So was your agreement to conduct transactions that
20
      involved the proceeds of wire fraud? Is that fair to say, that
21
      you were basically engaging in financial transactions involving
22
      the proceeds of wire fraud? Is that fair?
23
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
24
               THE COURT: And you did so, or you agreed with others
25
      to do this, so that the fact that they were the proceeds of
```

wire fraud could be concealed; is that correct, sir? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 3 THE COURT: At the time that you did this, did you know that what you were agreeing to do was to conceal the fact 4 5 that these transactions, or the money involved in these transactions, was the proceeds of wire fraud? 6 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. THE COURT: Did you also know, sir, that what you were 8 9 agreeing to do was wrong and illegal? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. THE COURT: One moment, please, sir? 11 12 (Pause) 13 THE COURT: Mr. Spodek, do you know of any valid defense that would prevail at trial or any other reason why 14 15 Mr. Njemanze should not be permitted to plead guilty? 16 MR. SPODEK: No, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 Mr. Sobelman, are there additional questions that you 19 would like me to ask Mr. Njemanze? 20 MR. SOBELMAN: No, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Could you please tell me, sir, were this 22 case to proceed to trial, what types of evidence might be 23 introduced at that trial? 24 MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor, among other things, there 25 would be evidence from -- there would be electronic evidence

25

from the defendant's -- one moment? 1 2 THE COURT: Of course. 3 (Pause) 4 MR. SOBELMAN: -- from a codefendant's phone that 5 shows extensive communications between this defendant and that 6 codefendant engaging in the conspiracy that your Honor just 7 questioned the defendant about. 8 THE COURT: Yes. 9 MR. SOBELMAN: There would also be bank records, 10 financial records, and financial analysis showing the flow of 11 funds and the connections to the conversations and messages 12 between this defendant and that codefendant. 13 In addition, there would be victim testimony that 14 describe the ways in which they were defrauded in the 15 underlying wire fraud scheme and the fact that they sent the money not understanding where it was going, having been lied 16 17 to, to accounts that were either controlled by or transacted in 18 by this defendant and his codefendant. 19 THE COURT: Thank you for letting me know. 20 Mr. Njemanze, did you just now hear the prosecutor? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 22 THE COURT: Do you understand, sir, that if this case 23 were to proceed to trial, that would be part or all of the 24 government's evidence at that trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Mr. Spodek, do you agree that there is a sufficient factual predicate for a guilty plea?

MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there any reason why I should not accept it?

MR. SPODEK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Sobelman, do you agree that there is a sufficient factual predicate for a guilty plea?

MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there any reason why I should not accept it?

MR. SOBELMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, at this time do you wish to enter a plea of guilty to Count One of Superseding Information S6:18 CR 117?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, because you've acknowledged that you are, in fact, guilty as charged in this count, because I'm satisfied that you know of your rights, including your right to go to trial, because I'm satisfied that you're aware of the elements of this offense and the penalties associated with this, and because I find that you are knowingly and voluntarily pleading guilty, I will accept your guilty plea, and I will enter a judgment of guilty on Count One of this information.

At a later stage, sir, the case will proceed to sentencing. And you heard me earlier speak about a presentence investigation report that the probation office would prepare.

I'm going to order that that report not be prepared unless your attorney or someone from his office is there with you at the interview.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

understand, I don't provide legal advice -- I'm not doing that here -- I'm giving you a thought. You'll talk about the thought with your attorney. If you choose to speak to the probation officer about anything, I would ask that you ensure that what you say to the probation officer is as complete and as accurate as it can be. I say that because I rely very heavily on the presentence report in deciding what is an appropriate sentence. That presentence report is most useful to me when it is accurate and when it is complete. You will have an opportunity to see that report before I ever see it. I invite you to look at it and to discuss it with your attorney, and if there is anything that you wish to modify, or correct, or object to, you will have an opportunity to do that.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: Ms. Noriega, may I please have a

24

1	sentencing date?		
2	And may I ask the parties: Should we go out the		
3	traditional 120 days or so?		
4	MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor.		
5	THE COURT: Okay.		
6	Mr. Spodek, the same?		
7	MR. SPODEK: Yes, that would be ideal, your Honor.		
8	THE COURT: Thank you for letting me know.		
9	Ms. Noriega?		
10	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, your Honor.		
11	I had it for 90 days. Sorry.		
12	THE COURT: Ninety days may be fine. I don't know		
13	what the probation office is looking for these days.		
14	Whatever we can try 90.		
15	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Okay. July 16th, at 3:00 p.m.		
16	MR. SPODEK: That's fine for us, your Honor.		
17	MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor.		
18	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.		
19	If it turns out the probation office needs more time,		
20	they will certainly let us know.		
21	Mr. Sobelman, to the extent you have not already done		
22	so, please arrange to have the factual statement presented to		
23	the probation office.		

arrange for the interview of your client.

And, Mr. Spodek, in the next two weeks, if you could

24

25

1 MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: I'll remind the parties I'd like the 2 3 defense sentencing submission two weeks in advance of 4 sentencing, the government's responsive submission one week in 5 advance of sentencing, so that I can have a meaningful 6 opportunity to look at them. 7 Let me now talk to the parties about the issue of It was my understanding -- it may still be my 8 bail. 9 understanding -- that the parties have reviewed the pretrial 10 services report that was prepared in connection with this case. 11 Am I correct? 12 MR. SOBELMAN: The government has, yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 Mr. Spodek, you've seen it as well? 15 MR. SPODEK: Yes, I've reviewed it. THE COURT: I have a copy as well. I've reviewed it. 16 17 Thank you for sending it to me in advance of this proceeding. Have the parties discussed whether there is a set of 18 19 conditions on which the parties agree, and pursuant to which, 20 Mr. Njemanze could be released, and, if so, may I please hear 21 what that is? 22 MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor, we have. And we have 23 a set of conditions that we jointly propose to your Honor.

by three financially responsible persons;

First, \$250,000 personal recognizance bond, cosigned

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Second, supervision as directed by pretrial services; Third, travel restricted to the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, and the Central District of California, and points in between for purposes of travel to court appearances, and, in addition, he may travel for work outside of the Central District of California with preapproval by pretrial services; That he be required to surrender all travel documents and refrain from making any new applications. And I will note, as --THE COURT: How does that work with the preceding condition that you've just identified? MR. SOBELMAN: By travel documents, we mean international travel documents. THE COURT: Thank you. MR. SOBELMAN: Such as a passport. And I will note that this defendant surrendered his passport to the agents previously, and they will be providing that to pretrial services. THE COURT: Okay. MR. SOBELMAN: That the Court impose a curfew to be directed by pretrial services, which will be enforced by electronic monitoring; That the defendant maintain or seek employment;

And that the defendant shall be released on his own

signature today, with two weeks to meet the conditions, principally the three financially responsible persons cosigning the bond.

THE COURT: Is there any provision or discussion about drug testing or treatment? Do you wish it to be as directed by the pretrial services office?

MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor, we would have no objection to that. We didn't discuss it, and my reading of the pretrial services report is that he indicated no history of substance abuse, but we defer to the Court on whether that's necessary.

THE COURT: Let me please speak with the pretrial services officer.

In these situations, where there is no obvious history of drug abuse, is it preferable that I not provide anything or that I have it set up as drug testing and treatment as directed?

MR. CHAN: Your Honor, we could have, on the new disposition sheet, that we have indicated submit one urine test; if positive, drug testing and treatment.

THE COURT: Is that your suggestion for this case?

MR. CHAN: Yes, we can have him do that.

THE COURT: Let me make sure that is still something the parties would agree with.

MR. SOBELMAN: The government defers to the Court and pretrial services on this.

```
THE COURT:
1
                          Okay.
 2
               Mr. Spodek, the same?
 3
               MR. SPODEK: Yes, Judge.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay.
                                 Thank you.
 5
               Let me, please, understand a little bit better the
6
      travel situation. I have a pretrial services report that
 7
      recites a Baltimore, Maryland address, and, yet, I think I
      understand from the report, that it is Mr. Njemanze's intent to
8
9
     move out to California. Is that correct? You'll excuse me if
10
      I'm a little bit confused as to which states are in play.
11
               Mr. Spodek, do you want to be heard on this issue?
12
               MR. SPODEK: Sure. Absolutely, Judge.
13
               THE COURT: Thank you.
14
               MR. SPODEK: The Maryland address is his --
      historically his home address. He is living with a friend
15
      currently in California, and he would like to remain living
16
17
      with the friend during the pendency of this case.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. I think I do understand that.
19
               And the government has no objection to that?
20
               MR. SOBELMAN: No objection, your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: And, Ms. Chan, do you also agree with
22
            There would be no problem in having him living in
      California?
23
24
                          That should not be a problem. We will
               MR. CHAN:
25
      request courtesy supervision in California.
```

THE COURT: As a matter of courtesy, they would also handle the electronic monitoring and the curfew?

MR. CHAN: That is correct.

THE COURT: Thank you for letting me know.

One moment, please. I want to make sure I understand these conditions before I agree to them. Thank you.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Counsel, I've accepted these conditions, and they are as follows: A \$25,000 personal recognizance bond signed by three financially responsible parties; travel restricted to the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the Central District of California, places covered by travel to court, and travel for work as approved by pretrial services; the surrender of travel documents and no new applications; pretrial supervision, as directed by pretrial services; the submission to one urinalysis, and if positive, the additional condition of drug testing or treatment; a curfew and electronic monitoring, as administered by the pretrial services office; a directive that the defendant either continue or seek employment; and Mr. Njemanze being released on his own signature, with the remaining conditions met on or before April 25th of 2019.

Is there anything that I've stated incorrectly?

MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor may have said 25,000. I
believe it's 250,000.

1	THE COURT: 250,000. I'm sorry if I said 25,000.		
2	MR. SOBELMAN: Thank you, your Honor.		
3	THE COURT: You'll excuse me. I saw and I heard		
4	250,000.		
5	MR. SOBELMAN: Thank you, your Honor.		
6	THE COURT: So thank you.		
7	All right. Mr. Spodek, you agree as well, sir?		
8	MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor.		
9	THE COURT: Thank you very much. I will adopt that.		
10	(Pause)		
11	THE COURT: Counsel, I've done three duplicate		
12	originals, which I think will suffice. I'm going to have my		
13	deputy show them to you, and you'll tell me if they will		
	suffice.		
14	suffice.		
14 15	suffice. Is there something to be added?		
15	Is there something to be added?		
15 16	Is there something to be added? MR. SOBELMAN: Nothing from the government, your		
15 16 17	Is there something to be added? MR. SOBELMAN: Nothing from the government, your Honor.		
15 16 17 18	Is there something to be added? MR. SOBELMAN: Nothing from the government, your Honor. MR. SPODEK: Nothing, Judge.		
15 16 17 18 19	Is there something to be added? MR. SOBELMAN: Nothing from the government, your Honor. MR. SPODEK: Nothing, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. Nothing from pretrial services; is		
15 16 17 18 19 20	Is there something to be added? MR. SOBELMAN: Nothing from the government, your Honor. MR. SPODEK: Nothing, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. Nothing from pretrial services; is that correct?		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Is there something to be added? MR. SOBELMAN: Nothing from the government, your Honor. MR. SPODEK: Nothing, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. Nothing from pretrial services; is that correct? MR. CHAN: That's correct.		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Is there something to be added? MR. SOBELMAN: Nothing from the government, your Honor. MR. SPODEK: Nothing, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. Nothing from pretrial services; is that correct? MR. CHAN: That's correct. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Is there something to be added? MR. SOBELMAN: Nothing from the government, your Honor. MR. SPODEK: Nothing, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. Nothing from pretrial services; is that correct? MR. CHAN: That's correct. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Spodek, may I address your client directly?		

Mr. Njemanze, as a result of the order that I've just issued and handed out copies of, you will be released on a series of bail conditions. You need to comply with those conditions, sir. You must follow everything that you are directed to do by the pretrial services officer, and you must, as well, abide by anything that is specified in that order.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: If you do not, I don't want to overstate the matter by saying only bad things can happen, but the possibility exists that you could be remanded, and if there are cosigners on your bond, the possibility exists that the bond could be foreclosed as to them.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE COURT: More broadly, sir, if you are directed to appear in this court, you have to be here. Right now, we've set up a sentencing date or a next conference date of July 16th, and you have to be here. If that date is changed, you'll have to be here on the changed date. If you are not present in this courtroom on a date and time where you've been ordered to be present in the courtroom, you could be prosecuted for a separate offense that is commonly known as bail-jumping.

Are you aware of that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I am.

```
1
               THE COURT: So do I understand you're going to be here
2
      when I order you to be here?
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am, I will be.
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 4
5
               Is there anything else the government wishes to bring
      to my attention in this proceeding?
6
 7
               MR. SOBELMAN: No, your Honor.
8
               THE COURT: Thank you.
9
               Mr. Spodek, is there anything that you'd like to bring
10
      to my attention on behalf of your client?
11
               MR. SPODEK: No, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: I thank you very much for staying this
13
      afternoon. We are adjourned. Thank you.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	JC95njeS	sentence		
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK			
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	New York, N.Y.		
4	v.	18 Cr. 117 (KPF)		
5	KEMOKALAM NJEMANZE,			
6	Defendant.			
7		x		
8		December 9, 2019		
9		3:10 p.m.		
10	Before:			
11	HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA,			
12		District Judge		
13				
14	APPEARANCES			
15	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attor	rney for the		
16	Southern District of BY: JULIANA MURRAY	-		
17	Assistant United St	tates Attorney		
18	TODD A. SPODEK Attorney for Defend	Nant		
19	_			
20	ALSO PRESENT: GREGORY HOLM, Secret Service			
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

JC95njeS sentence

1 (Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your name for the record, beginning with the government.

MS. MURRAY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Juliana murray on behalf of the United States. I am joined at counsel table by Special Agent Gregory Holm, with the U.S. Secret Service.

THE COURT: Good afternoon to both of you, and thank you.

Hello, Mr. Spodek.

MR. SPODEK: Good afternoon, your Honor. Gregory Spodek and to my left is Mr. Kemokalam Njemanze.

THE COURT: Good afternoon to both of you.

Sir, I may have mispronounced your client's last name.

May I have his preferred pronunciation?

THE DEFENDANT: Njemanze.

THE COURT: I am having difficulty with the N, but thank you.

Mr. Spodek, is there anyone else here in the courtroom to support your client today?

MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. In the second row is Ms. Kelechi Ukpaka who is Mr. Njemanze's girlfriend.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you and, yes, I believe I read about her in the presentence investigation report so she is welcome. Thank you very much for coming this afternoon.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sentence

Let me make sure I have the documents I should have in connection with sentencing. I have a presentence investigation report and it is dated September 12 of 2019. I have a sentencing submission that is dated December 3rd, with exhibits, including some certificates. I have a government sentencing submission that is dated December 4 of 2019. I have a submission that I have just received in the last few hours with some additional materials on behalf of Mr. Njemanze. I have a notice of intent to request judicial removal, a consent preliminary order of forfeiture money judgment, and an order of restitution. Ms. Murray, should I have anything else from the government? MS. MURRAY: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Spodek, should I have anything else from the defense? MR. SPODEK: No, Judge. THE COURT: Good to know. Thank you. Ms. Murray, if I could begin with you, has the government had a sufficient opportunity under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32 to review the presentence investigation report in this case? MS. MURRAY: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And are there any objections to its

contents?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MURRAY: Your Honor, the only point that I would note, and I need to find the citation, with respect to the defendant's status, in preparing the JRO for this proceeding we learned that the defendant does not have any legal status in the U.S., he is not a green card holder. My understanding is that he was a visa overstay subject to removal under INA Section 237(a)(1)(B). There was an application that he had filled out and submitted but it was never approved so there was never any legal status conferred to the defendant.

THE COURT: So, you are looking at the information page, page 2 of the PSR, which indicates that his immigration status is one of permanent resident with a green card. Is that correct?

> Thank you, your Honor; yes. MS. MURRAY: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Spodek, do you agree that that is an error in the presentence investigation report?

MR. SPODEK: Yes, Judge; I do.

THE COURT: We will make that change.

Mr. Spodek, let me turn to you, sir. Have you and your client had sufficient opportunity, under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32, to review the presentence investigation report in this case?

MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And we have just talked about one

JC95njeS sentence correction that the government has proposed. Do you have any 1 2 corrections or objections to propose to the report, sir? 3 MR. SPODEK: Nothing in addition to that one. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Don't go too far away, sir, I have 5 a couple more questions for you. MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 8 May I address your client directly? 9 MR. SPODEK: Yes. Of course. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Njemanze, have you had an opportunity 11 to review the presentence investigation report in this case? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: And to the extent there was any 14 information that you wanted to communicate to the probation 15 officer to give to me, were you able to give that information 16 to your attorney? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Could you repeat that again? 18 THE COURT: Of course. I will ask that question 19 better. 20 To the best of your understanding, everything in the 21 presentence report is correct, sir? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

THE COURT: And to the extent that there was

information that you wanted me to know, were you able to give

that information to your attorney?

23

24

25

Do

JC95njeS sentence 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And so his submissions to me in connection 2 3 with this case reflect that information? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. 6 Mr. Spodek, an additional question for you, sir. 7 the back of this presentence investigation report beginning at page 22 there are mandatory and standard and special conditions 8 9 of supervised release. Have you had an opportunity to review 10 those with your client? 11 MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Do you have any objection to any of the 13 proposed special conditions of supervised release? 14 MR. SPODEK: No, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: And may I, sir, refer to them collectively as the mandatory, standard, and special conditions of 16 supervised release rather than reading them into the record? 17 MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: And, again, may I address your client 20 directly? 21 MR. SPODEK: Of course. 22 THE COURT: Thank you.

defense counsel about the conditions of supervised release.

you recall reviewing those with your attorney?

Mr. Njemanze, have you just heard me speaking with

23

24

25

JC95njeS sentence

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, for convenience, if it is okay with you, I am going to refer to them as a group as the mandatory standard and special conditions, without reading each one here in open court.

Are you comfortable with that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Will you understand what I am referring to, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you for letting me know.

Mr. Spodek, you may sit down for a little bit, sir.

MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Murray, a few questions for you, please.

You are welcome to tell me that you would rather answer these in your general sentencing presentation but just a few things I would like clarification on. There is, to me, some confusion about Mr. Njemanze's marriage because I think I am understanding from the government's submission that you have a belief that it may have been entered into principally or solely for the purpose of obtaining status in this country and not for some other reason.

Do you want to be heard on that further?

MS. MURRAY: If I may have a moment, your Honor?

```
JC95njeS
                                 sentence
1
               THE COURT: Yes, you may.
 2
               MS. MURRAY: Thank you.
 3
               THE COURT: And if I misunderstood your submission,
 4
      please, tell me.
 5
                (Counsel conferring)
                (Pages 9-15 SEALED by order of the Court)
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court)

THE COURT: Mr. Spodek, you are welcome to sit down. Thank you.

MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me, before I forget, adopt the presentence investigation report, the factual findings that are contained in it and the guidelines calculations that are contained in it.

Ms. Murray, I would like to hear from you in connection with sentencing and I want to hear from you on whatever you want to tell me. There are a few issues raised in Mr. Spodek's submission that would be useful for me to have your position on and some of them I believe are addressed in your written submission but I will ask you, nonetheless, to repeat it. They include the statements that Mr. Njemanze was in a nonsupervisory role with minimal financial gain, sort of a lesser player in this conspiracy, especially when compared with someone like Mr. Ifeanyi Ezeji; secondly, that I should consider the collateral immigration consequences that he has that not everyone in this case has.

I think those are the principal issues that are emphasized in his submission but whatever else would you like to tell me, I am here to hear.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you, your Honor, and I will address those points briefly but I am happy to answer any other

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

specific questions your Honor has on those points.

For the reasons that were in our written sentencing submission, the government believes that a guideline sentence is appropriate in this case. The primary reasons are the nature and seriousness of the offense. As we know, these business e-mail compromise schemes do have real victims. These are crimes where the frauds are carefully constructed to evade detection and to deceive people, innocent people and unwitting victims, whose funds are stolen.

Just to give one specific example, for your Honor, there is a woman named Susan Bell who was one of the victims of this scheme. She is the person whose \$45,000 and change is the subject of the order of restitution. It was a woman who was purchasing a home and in the process of her home loan she was provided what she believed to be a valid e-mail indicating that she should wire the funds for her home loan to a certain place. Unknown to her this was actually one of the e-mails that was part of the business e-mail compromise scheme that the defendant participated in. So, her \$45,000 and change went to this conspiracy rather than to its intended purpose which was to assist her in purchasing a home.

This defendant, in particular, coordinated with Mr. Ifeanyi Ezeji, among others, about Susan Bell, and we know that from the agent's review of electronic evidence in this We have seen a video that Ifeanyi Ezeji sent to this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendant that is essentially a video, it is effectively a screenshot showing the wire transfer of this \$45,000 and change. And there is also communications within the electronic communications that indicates Ms. Bell's name.

So, we know that this defendant was involved in that particular example of one of the acts in this conspiracy. is just one example but so that your Honor understands his role in the conspiracy.

He also coordinated the transfer of funds including not only with Ifeanyi Ezeji but with other co-conspirators in other countries like Nigeria.

Now, with respect to his role and his relative culpability, which I think goes to a point made in the defense submission and also to your Honor's question, the government does agree that he is less culpable than Ifeanyi Ezeji, for That said, in the flowchart of the co-conspirators that have been charged in this case, we do believe he is in the middle somewhere. He is actively coordinating the transfer of funds and his participation is not limited to one co-conspirator. For example, he is not just coordinating with Ifeanyi Ezeji. He is not a slightly more isolated member of the conspiracy like, for example, Christopher Ezeji, who did passports but that was his role and that was a limited cap and This defendant did have involvement with multiple role. members of the conspiracy whether it was direct text, WhatsApp

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

messages, directing wire transfers, confirming wire transfers of members of the conspiracy who were not in the United States.

So, we take no position on whether it was a supervisory role or not but I would say it was an active role and it certainly wasn't a limited role in the way that some of the other less culpable defendants in this case had.

We also believe that a guideline sentence is appropriate in this case to promote adequate deterrence, both specific deterrence for this defendant and general deterrence. On the specific deterrence point I don't disagree that the immigration consequences are a factor for this defendant that weren't necessarily present for other defendants. This defendant has consented to judicial removal upon his sentencing so there is less concern with this defendant not being adequately deterred than there would have been with other defendants who would stay in the country. It is a bit convoluted, I am happy to say that again, but I do agree that that is a factor that again can be and should be considered in determining deterrence and what sentence is appropriate. said, in addition to the specific deterrence here, we believe that a sentence within the guidelines range is necessary to adequately deter other individuals who might be involved in this kind of fraud -- other individuals, whether they have legal immigration status or not but individuals who may not make a lot of profit from the scheme but who do a lot of harm

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and who create a lot of costs to innocent victims.

So, with respect to the profit that this defendant made, I know the defense has suggested that it was around \$6,000 from his role in the scheme, if that's the case that's a minimal conflict. That said, we have over \$100,000 in identifiable losses that this defendant was responsible for with his co-conspirators including, as I mentioned, one identifiable victim and \$45,000 for that single transaction.

So, small amount of profit personally perhaps, but even if an individual doesn't profit, the government want to make sure that this conduct is deterred because, as I said, there are real victims.

THE COURT: Just one moment, please?

MS. MURRAY: Yes.

THE COURT: I am understanding from paragraph 70 of the presentence investigation report that Mr. Njemanze came here in or about February of 2016. I thought I understood as well from the information or the charging instrument in this case that the criminal conduct was from 2016 until 2017. Is it the government's understanding that the defendant came here just to participate in this fraud or for some other reason? And, should that matter?

MS. MURRAY: If I may have just a moment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Take whatever time you need, please.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Counsel conferring)

MS. MURRAY: Your Honor, it is not our understanding that the defendant came to the U.S. in February of 2016 for the specific purpose of participating in this conspiracy. I'm not exactly sure how the dates charged in the superseding information, if it is a generality in or about 2016. sure how he those match up with his arrival. We do understand that he also had legitimate employment at or around the time that he came to the U.S. in early 2016.

THE COURT: Could you remind me, please, the length of time over which the entire conspiracy existed?

MS. MURRAY: Yes, your Honor. Just one moment, please.

(Counsel and Agent conferring)

MS. MURRAY: Your Honor, the approximate time period of the conspiracy was around September of 2016, those are some of the first specific victims and transactions involving the conspiracy that we have identified; September 2016 until around August of 2017 when Ifeanyi Ezeji was arrested.

THE COURT: Why I am asking is that, at paragraph 79 of the presentence investigation report, it recites that Mr. Njemanze was unemployed from his arrival here in February of 2016 until September of 2017. So, your statements to me about his having a history of continued employment, it seems that it pre-dates and post-dates his conduct that brings him

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

here before me today.

MS. MURRAY: Your Honor, that appears right to me from the presentence report. I don't -- and I apologize if I misspoke -- it is my understanding that he did not come for the purpose of the conspiracy. I guess I should say I don't have an understanding of why he did come.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: I do understand that at some point in his time in the U.S. he has had legitimate employment but I don't have an understanding of whether that is why he came to the U.S.

THE COURT: I appreciate the clarification and I will let you continue.

MS. MURRAY: Essentially I am finished, your Honor.

I would just note, again to the point that your Honor had raised and that the defense has raised, the government also contends that a guideline sentence is appropriate here to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities between this defendant and his co-defendants who have been charged. At page 3 of our written submission we provided to the Court a table that shows other defendants in this case and we ranked those in what we believe is our best understanding of the relative order of culpability and that table also shows the quidelines range of each of those defendants and then for those who have been sentenced the sentence that has been imposed. For the reasons

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that we laid out in that table and then also in the discussion about this defendant's relative role in the conspiracy, we believe that a sentence within the 18 to 24 months guideline range would appropriately reflect the seriousness of this defendant's conduct in the offense, would appropriately encourage adequate deterrence for this defendant and general deterrence, and would be appropriate in light of the other defendants in this case this.

> THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Spodek, I will hear from you now, sir.

MR. SPODEK: Your Honor, Kemo, as I know him, is 35 years old, stands before you as a current resident -- not in the immigration vocabulary but is a resident of America for four years. He has been working throughout those four years as an electronic medical record consultant and proof of that I believe was provided to pretrial and, in fact, I did request your Honor give permission for some employment jobs over the time of this case. He was making approximately \$3,200 a week so almost \$150,000 annually if he had steady employment.

THE COURT: I am understanding this began in 2017; is that correct?

MR. SPODEK: The employment, your Honor, or the conspiracy?

THE COURT: No, sir; the employment. I am looking, in particular, at paragraph 79 and 80 of the presentence

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sentence

investigation report and it recites unemployment from February 2016 through September of 2017, and then employment as a self-employed electronic medical record consultant since September of 2017.

I just want to make sure that's correct.

MR. SPODEK: Yes, Judge; that is correct.

Okay. Please go from there, sir. THE COURT:

MR. SPODEK: He has had a number of opportunities for gainful employment here and really has taken advantage of the life that he can make here. He came to the U.S. for economic reasons and, as your Honor is keenly aware, these financial frauds are rampant in Nigeria and people that he knows from home are involved in them and he has taken responsibility for getting himself mixed up into something that will forever affect him, his family, his girlfriend, his future, his career. Every aspect of his life has been permeated by his decision to be involved in this.

He took responsibility early on, he took a timely plea, he tried to cooperate to the best of his abilities. Even though he may not have been a hundred percent forthright in the initial stage of the meeting he ultimately was forthright and I think that is commendable and I think that it's easy for an outsider to look at a meeting with the government and say How is that you weren't a hundred percent forthright and honest from the minute you start talking? but the pressures are

that's what he ultimately did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

immeasurable. And when you are a foreigner at one of these meetings and your whole life is on the line, often times it takes a minute and consultation with your attorney to come to terms with the situation and express yourself honestly. And

Judge, from my calculation and my understanding he may have made about \$1,500 to a max of \$5,000. So, we are talking about a conspiracy here that's 11 months, we are talking about someone who didn't have enough information to cooperate. By the government's own account he didn't have enough information. He was a middle-man conveying messages between people and he made a horrible mistake and he possibly profited to the tune of \$5,000 max and I believe the government would agree with that number, or \$6,000 going that far.

THE COURT: But you would agree that he is tied to losses in excess of \$100,000?

MR. SPODEK: Yes, your Honor. Yes, I would. It is just his personal profit as far as his involvement.

Judge, he certainly didn't have any sort of supervisory role, he didn't set anything in motion, he did didn't create the scheme or tried to arrange for other people to be involved in the scheme. He was a player in the scheme but it certainly wasn't something that he created and was trying to perpetuate. I think it is worth noting that I believe the scheme continued on past his involvement. So, I do JC95njeS sentence

think that at some point he wasn't involved anymore and that he wasn't actively involved.

THE COURT: When did you understand the period of his involvement to span, sir?

MR. SPODEK: Judge, if I could have one moment?

THE COURT: Of course. Take whatever time you need.

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MR. SPODEK: Judge, from my investigation and my conversations with my client, he ceased communicating with Mr. Azika around March of 2017.

THE COURT: Sir, is that Mr. Ezeji or Mr. Azika?

MR. SPODEK: Ezeji. Ezeji.

THE COURT: Yes; Ifeanyi Ezeji. Okay, yes. Tell me again, please, the month, sir?

MR. SPODEK: So, from my investigation and my understanding, he was involved from September 2016 until around March of 2017.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Please continue.

MR. SPODEK: Judge, as you have seen from my sentencing submission, this is someone who has tried to make a better life here and certainly has tried to improve himself and be a productive member of society here. We have attached a number of certificates as well as the fact that he was giving blood and that he has created some GoFundMe pages to help with people who suffer from diseases.

Lastly, Judge, the only thing that I would bring up is that the collateral consequences for him are severe. He is going to be deported back to Nigeria. He has agreed, he has taken the burden away from the government to necessarily litigate that issue. And his life, again, won't be the same no matter what. The opportunities are not there in Nigeria like they are here and he, unfortunately, will not necessarily be able to come back to the United States and I think that's something your Honor should take into consideration.

I think all of those points along with the points I raised in our original submission and the amended one warrant a sentence of time-served, Judge. I hope your Honor will take all of that into consideration.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Njemanze, if you would like to speak to me now in connection with your sentencing I would be happy to hear from you. You are not obligated to speak with me but you are invited to do so. And, if you do speak with me, I will take very seriously what you have to say. What I will ask you, sir, is that if you are speaking that you speak louder and slower than you think you need to so that everyone in this courtroom can hear.

Would you like to be heard, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I will hear from you now. Thank you. You are welcome to be seated or stand, however you are more comfortable.

> THE DEFENDANT: I will stand.

Thank you, your Honor. Thank you everyone. Forgive me if I get emotional at some point.

THE COURT: It is very understandable, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: So, I moved to this country four years ago for the reason of seeking greener pastures, trying to assist my family because it was a tough time in Nigeria at that point.

So, after that, getting here, I have always been a patient person, you know, but at some point I think I lost my ability to be patient because I really need that to assist to do a lot. And then I received a call four years ago, the call has changed my life and, honestly, if I could take back the hands of time I would not have received that call for any What I did was utterly disgusting. There is no And this brought me closer than I could ever imagine excuse. to God and I have asked God for forgiveness and I hope I will be forgiving him also.

I have my father who will be so disappointed because he raised me better. I have someone also that I let down. To all of you, I am sorry.

> THE COURT: Take your time, sir. Don't worry. We can

JC95njeS sentence

1 pause.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Whatever punishment I have at this time, it's -- it's whatever it is, no problem. Like I said, I have asked God for forgiveness and I hope you will forgive me also.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

What I am going to do now is what I do in all sentencings or almost all sentencings and that is to take a break so that I can think about everything that's just been said here, think about the written materials I have received, and come back with what I hope is the fairest sentence. So, I will be away for about 5 for 10 minutes, I will come back as soon as I can, and I will ask for your a patience during that time.

Thank you all very much.

(recess)

THE COURT: Ms. Murray, it turns out that I did have a couple of questions that I came to while I was preparing so let me ask this question first, please.

With respect to the government's restitution order and schedule of victims there is a little bit of disconnect between the name listed in the presentence investigation report and the

22

23

24

25

source of confusion.

sentence

1 name that is listed as the payee. I imagine maybe there are 2 two sides of the same transaction but may I hear from you on 3 that, please? 4 MS. MURRAY: Yes, your Honor; that's correct. 5 So, Susan bell is the name of the individual. 6 payee that is listed in the restitution order is the loan 7 company or the mortgage company that is responsible for the amount of money that was paid, for the \$45,000, because it was 8 9 a transaction Ms. Bell was making through a loan officer for a 10 home loan, that is the actual victim that is responsible for 11 the amount of that money. 12 THE COURT: Should I amend the presentence 13 investigation report to make clear that that restitution should 14 be payable to True Home Solutions, LLC, instead of to the Clerk of the U.S. District Court for disbursement to her? 15 16 MS. MURRAY: Yes, your Honor. We would appreciate 17 that. Thank you. 18 THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Spodek, you don't a 19 disagree, sir; is that correct? 20 MR. SPODEK: No. Absolutely not. 21 THE COURT: Terrific. I will make that change at page 25 of the presentence investigation report. That was one

Ms. Murray, just another question for you, please, and perhaps the case agent might be useful on this as well. What I

sentence

saw in the government's submission and in the presentence investigation report were references to Mr. Njemanze sending numerous text messages to Mr. Ezeji and to other members of the conspiracy, and I guess the issue for me is I don't know what numerous means. I can tell you that there are three that are listed in the presentence investigation report and three could be numerous but there could be tens, there could be hundreds, there could be thousands of messages in this six-month time frame and I am trying to get a sense of the volume of messages or volume of communications that Mr. Njemanze had either with members of the conspiracy whom I have met, or with individuals whom you understand to be members of the conspiracy outside of the group in the indictment.

MS. MURRAY: Yes. Just a moment, please?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Counsel conferring)

MS. MURRAY: Your Honor, my understanding with respect to the electronic evidence is we have on the order of hundreds of WhatsApp messages between the defendant and Ifeanyi Ezeji. Certainly not tens, it is more in the magnitude of hundreds relating to this conspiracy.

With respect to electronic communications with other co-conspirators, from the electronic evidence that the government has been able to retrieve through search and seize in the course of the investigation, because we had Ifeanyi

JC95njeS sentence

Ezeji's cell phone we don't have, as I understand, the defendant's communications with other members of the conspiracy but it is our understanding, both through the investigation, our view of the defendant's role and then statements he made to us during proffers, that he engaged in electronic communications with other members of the conspiracy including in countries like Nigeria.

THE COURT: Yes. I shouldn't know about the proffer stuff and I therefore won't, but what you are saying is you haven't done as deep a dive into those messages because you had the evidence you needed from Ifeanyi Ezeji, yes?

MS. MURRAY: That's correct; and because the defendant chose to waive indictment so we didn't complete our investigation, necessarily, with respect to this defendant.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Spodek, if you want to be heard on this issue I would be happy to hear from you, or you may just agree with what the government has said.

MR. SPODEK: No. I have nothing to add, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. What I am going to do now is to describe the sentence that I intend to impose but I will give each side an opportunity to make legal objections before the sentence is actually imposed.

We have spoken this afternoon about a number of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

purposes of sentencing and they are set forth in Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of United States Code and I will just list a few of them that come into play or that are particular focus for me in this case.

I must consider the nature and circumstances of the I must consider the history and characteristics of offense. Mr. Njemanze. I must consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide a just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes by Mr. Njemanze, and to provide him with needed educational and vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. I must consider the sentencing guidelines and I will speak about them momentarily. I must consider the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among similarly situated defendants. And I must consider the need to provide restitution to the victims.

Proceeding now to the guidelines calculations, I replicate those in the presentence investigation report. base offense level is 8. There is an eight-level enhancement for the amount of loss, and a two-level enhancement because the conviction is under Section 1956 of Title 18 of United States There is a three-level reduction for acceptance of Code. responsibility and that yields an adjusted offense level of 15.

Mr. Njemanze has no criminal history points and is therefore in Criminal History Category I and his resulting guidelines range is 18 to 24 months' imprisonment. The defense has sought time-served or a below guidelines sentence. The probation office has recommended a sentence at the bottom of the range. The government has asked for a sentence within the applicable guidelines range of 18 to 24 months.

Let me say that it mattered to me, the breadth and the length and the importance of Mr. Njemanze's conduct in this case and that is why I was asking the government because, to me, there are folks in the case who might have been involved in a more limited capacity or in other cases that there may be individuals who are involved in perhaps passing one e-mail or setting up one account and I think they are qualitatively different from someone who is exchanging hundreds of e-mails with the person who is at the top of the charged conspiracy in my case and is also in communication with folks in other countries. And, each of these e-mails was part of a fraud that resulted in real losses to a number of victims.

I do appreciate very much and understand

Mr. Njemanze's efforts at accepting responsibility. I

understand and appreciate his participation in the judicial

removal order. I understand his meetings with the government.

For me, however, these do not counsel in favor of a time-served

sentence or even a non-guideline sentence but they counsel in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

favor of a sentence at or towards the bottom of the applicable quidelines range.

Again, I am concerned about the sheer amount of time and effort -- time being six months and many occasions in which he could have stopped; and effort being his criticality to the scheme insofar as he was able to put Mr. Ifeanyi Ezeji in contact with individuals here and in other countries who were very much involved in the losses.

I have considered, as well, while I don't think that this is a case of specific deterrence, I do think this is a case of general deterrence. I don't think it is appropriate, for example, to give a serious below guideline sentence or a serious downward variance under the guidelines just because someone has overstayed their visa and has engaged in fraud and is willing to return home.

Recognizing the degree to which Mr. Njemanze has accepted responsibility but counter-balancing that by the scope of the fraud and the significance to the victims, I am imposing a term of 18 months' imprisonment and I am ordering that that term be followed by a term of period of supervised release of three years with the mandatory standard and special conditions of supervised release.

I am not ordering a fine. I am ordering restitution in the amount of \$45,745.74, and forfeiture in the amount of \$103,359.24. And, I am obligated to impose a mandatory special sentence

assessment of \$100.

Ms. Murray, my understanding is that the difference between restitution and forfeiture is that forfeiture was the amount attributable to Mr. Njemanze's conduct, whereas the restitution was the specific victim that you were able to identify?

MS. MURRAY: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Murray, is there any reason why I may not impose that sentence?

MS. MURRAY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Spodek, is there any reason why I may not impose that sentence?

MR. SPODEK: No, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Njemanze, please rise.

Sir, after considering all of the factors that are set forth in Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code, I find that a term of 18 months' imprisonment is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with all of the purposes of sentencing. I will order that that term of imprisonment be followed by a term of three years of supervised release although, as a practical matter, that may be rendered a academic if you were to be removed from this country.

I am not imposing a fine. I am imposing restitution and forfeiture in the amounts that I have just listed, and I am

JC95njeS sentence

obligated to impose a \$100 special assessment. 1 2 Do you understand that, sir? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 4 THE COURT: Please be seated, sir. 5 Mr. Njemanze, to the extent that you have not waived 6 this in any plea agreement that you have with the government, 7 you have the right to appeal from your conviction and from your sentence. If you are interested in appeal, I would ask you to 8 9 speak with Mr. Spodek at your earliest opportunity. You have, 10 generally speaking, two weeks from the date of entry of the 11 judgment of conviction, and it is my expectation that that 12 judgment will be entered tomorrow or the day after. 13 So, if appeal is something in which you are 14 interested, please, speak with your attorney. 15 Do you understand, sir? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Spodek, do you or your client have a 18 place of designation that you would like me to recommend to the Bureau of Prisons? 19 20 MR. SPODEK: No, Judge. 21 I would ask your Honor to consider giving Mr. Njemanze 22 time to self-surrender, if that's possible, considering his 23 agreement to deportation and the 18-month term of imprisonment. 24 THE COURT: Does the government have a position with 25

respect to that?

MS. MURRAY: Your Honor, the government doesn't have a position. It is my understanding that where there is a judicial removal order at the time of sentencing the defendant should be remanded or, in the alternative, will be taken into ICE custody and that removal order will be effective immediately. That is my understanding. That said, I don't see anyone here who could take the defendant into custody so I'm not really sure logistically —

THE COURT: Should I then?

MS. MURRAY: — of the self-surrender situation.

THE COURT: Should I then refrain from executing the judicial removal order? If there weren't that, what would the government's position be?

MS. MURRAY: I'm candidly not sure, your Honor. I don't know the mechanics of how these two interplay.

THE COURT: Let me ask the question more precisely.

Had you not signed the judicial removal order today, what would your position be on behalf of your office?

MS. MURRAY: Had I not signed it today my position would be that there is no objection to a self-surrender situation for this defendant.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

I will allow him to self-surrender and I will refrain from filing the judicial removal order for some period of time.

Mr. Spodek, there is no recommendation for place of

1	designation, sir.
2	MR. SPODEK: Judge, he is currently residing in Orange
3	County. If your Honor would be inclined to designate a
4	facility in that district, certainly that would be preferable.
5	THE COURT: All right.
6	MR. SPODEK: That's California, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: As distinguished from New York.
8	MR. SPODEK: Just making clear.
9	THE COURT: That is fine, sir. I did figure that out
10	based on some of the exhibits that you had submitted to me.
11	MR. SPODEK: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Sir, as well, my recollection is and
13	Ms. Murray you may have a different understanding it takes
14	about six weeks or so to actually get a designation
15	accomplished so I was going to suggest surrender in two months,
16	in 60 days.
17	Is there any objection to that, sir?
18	MR. SPODEK: No, Judge. That would be ideal.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	And Ms. Murray, is there objection to that with the
21	caveat you have already given me?
22	MS. MURRAY: No, your Honor. With that caveat, no.
23	THE COURT: I understand.
24	Ms. Noriega, may I have date in two months, please?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Friday, February 7, before 2:00

JC95njeS sentence 1 p.m. 2 THE COURT: Ms. Murray, are there any open counts? 3 don't believe there are any but I will hear from you if there 4 are. 5 MS. MURRAY: I don't believe so, your Honor; no. 6 THE COURT: From your perspective is there anything 7 else that I need to do today? MS. MURRAY: Not today, your Honor. Thank you. 8 9 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Spodek, is there anything else, from your 10 11 perspective, that I need to do this afternoon? 12 MR. SPODEK: No, your Honor. Thank you very much. 13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. 14 Mr. Njemanze, I wish you well, sir, and my expectation 15 is given the judicial order of removal, I will not be seeing you again but I wish you good luck in all of your future 16 17 endeavors. 18 Thank you, sir. 19 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: We are adjourned. Thank you. 21 000 22 23 24 25